DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 129 353 95 JC 760 514

AUTHOR Lombardi, John
TITLE No- or Low-Tuition: A Lost Cause. Topical Paper No. 58.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Los Angeles. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Coll. Information.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.s
PUB DATE Oct 76
NOTE 46p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; Educational Finance; Educational History; Educational Opportunities; *Educational Policy; Fees; *Junior Colleges; *Open Enrollment; *Student Costs; *Tuition

ABSTRACT

Almost from the beginning of the junior college movement, its educational leaders emphasized the desirability of maintaining a no-tuition policy in order to extend free public education through the first two years of college. However, at no time in the 75 year history of public two-year colleges has there been widespread acceptance of the no- or low-tuition policy. Periodically, state laws have prohibited tuition but all of them have been amended or circumvented, allowing colleges to impose fees. Today, no state prohibits the charging of tuition and/or fees. Tuition/fees in two-year colleges average from 50% to 60% of those charged in four-year colleges. Average tuition and fees in 1974-75 have been variously estimated at $263 to $337. For the majority of students nationally they range from $0-$99 (low) to $100-$299 (moderate), but for the majority of colleges they are moderate to high ($300-$499). Tuition rises annually at a rate of 15% or more and by 1980 will average $400. What effect tuition will have on the ideal of the "open door" depends on the amount of state and federal grants to institutions with limited incomes. It seems reasonable to expect that as tuition rises to the $400-$800 range, a large number of students from low income families will be unable to attend the two-year college. (Author/JDS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED129353

EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER
ERIC Clearinghouse For Junior Colleges
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

TOPICAL PAPER NUMBER 58

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

NO- OR LOW-TUITION: A LOST CAUSE

JC 760 514

NO- OR LOW-TUITION:
A LOST CAUSE

by

John Lombardi

Topical Paper No. 58

October 1976

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
University of California
Los Angeles 90024

The material in this Topical Paper was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the Council of Universities and Colleges of the American Association of Com. and Jr. Colleges for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either the Council of Universities and Colleges or the National Institute of Education.

For information about the availability of other Topical Papers, contact the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 96 Powell Library, University of California, Los Angeles, California 90024.

PREFACE

In the preparation of this paper I am indebted to a great many of my former associates in colleges, state offices and in professional organizations. They responded willingly to my requests for documents and their perceptions of the tuition situation. In addition I have made extensive use of the studies in and out of the ERIC system. The Bibliography is evidence of my indebtedness.

Grateful acknowledgment is extended to the staff of the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges: Barbara Booth, Librarian, not only searched the files for documents on tuition but kept me posted on new developments as they appeared in leaflets, newsletters and other fugitive materials.

Bonnie Sanchez, Associate Director of ERIC, did the final editorial review, compiled the bibliography and prepared the manuscript for publication.

Chilaine Mitchell, Clerk-Typist of ERIC, did all the typing of the manuscript.

Dr. Arthur M. Cohen, Director of the ERIC Clearinghouse, encouraged the writing of the Topical Paper, reviewed the manuscript and made suggestions that have been incorporated in the Paper.

NO- OR LOW-TUITION:

A LOST CAUSE

John Lombardi

Introduction

Almost from the beginning of the junior college movement its educational leaders emphasized the desirability of maintaining a no-tuition policy in order to extend free public education through the first two years of college. For these leaders tuition has been incompatible with the ideal of democratic institution that was, and by many is still, considered "essentially secondary in character" (Koos, 1924, p. 624). However almost from the beginning the number of colleges each year that charge tuition has been greater than the number that do not.

In the 1920s the objective of public educational institutions was to offer education with little or no cost to students, (Arnett, 1939) and in those institutions that charged tuition "the custom of giving financial assistance to students of slender means" prevailed in order "to prevent education from becoming the privilege of only the well-to-do" (Arnett, 1939, p. 6). Eells pointed out in 1931 that "in many states the enabling act of the state university specified that tuition shall be free" (Eells, 1931, p. 535). But, the need for additional funds led to the abandonment of the low- or no-tuition policy. Where laws continued to proscribe tuition state universities kept within the letter of the law by charging fees for janitorial, classroom heating and other services (Eells, 1931), a practice also adopted by junior colleges in similar circumstances.

Up to about 1937 the difference between tuition in the junior college and tuition in the public senior and private institutions was not as large as it has been since. In a study of 46 public four-year colleges and universities Arnett (1939) reported only one college charging more than $300 and one charging more than $150. Those charging less than $50 represented 37 percent of the total in 1928-29, 34.8 percent in 1932-33 and 28.3 percent in 1936-37. In the public junior colleges charging tuition during 1930-31 the range was from $50 to $200 (Eells, 1931). Eells noted: "In many cases

the students in the local public junior colleges are paying far larger proportion of the entire costs of instruction than is the case even in the private institutions" (1931, p. 535).

The rising tuition trend in the Twenties and Thirties seemed not to affect the fervor with which the no-tuition advocates pushed their crusade. At meetings of the American Association of Junior Colleges and in books, monographs and articles they presented their case, adopted resolutions and countered the arguments of the few who favored tuition. They may have been unduly influenced by the California situation where tuition was prohibited and fees were few and low. Moreover, since the growth of junior colleges proceeded at a more rapid pace than in the rest of the nation statistics relating to tuition were skewed by the unusually large number of California colleges and their large enrollments.

From time to time during the history of the junior college movement a few state legislatures emulated California's no-tuition policy when they adopted a plan for the establishment of junior colleges but the fact is that most of them later either prescribed that tuition be charged or made tuition optional with the colleges. In time all of the states including California either gave up the no-tuition policy or permitted colleges to charge a variety of fees which were often equal to the tuition charged by other colleges.

It is obvious from a study of the statistics regarding tuition that the free tuition policy encountered considerable opposition outside California. Not only were many legislators and members of local boards of trustees unsympathetic but a considerable number of the chief administrators of public junior colleges opposed the no tuition policy. At the Ninth Annual Meeting of the American Association of Junior Colleges in 1928, E.Q. Brothers presented a paper, "A Plan for State Support for Public Junior Colleges" in which he maintained that:

> "Many people, including those who are careful students of educational finance, share the opinion that where the student has monetary investment he is going to attack the problem of education more seriously than he does when it is handed to him for the asking" (1928, p. 123).

Whether or not Brothers assessed the real reason the no-tuition failed to spread, he was correct in asserting many people believed and still do that students should pay for part or all of their education. Yet Brothers belongs to a very small group of two-year college educators willing to publicly announce their position in favor of tuition. Among recent educators who have done so are Collins (1970), Palinchek (1973) and Richardson (1974). Actually, there was and is little need for the dissidents to be heard since in Richardson's words "Tuition is a practical necessity, and this fact is recognized by almost all community colleges although some of them call their charges to students by other names" (1974, p. 24). When the dissidents speak or write they add to Brothers' argument that it prevents affluent students from taking unfair advantage of free education, it places the two-year college on the same footing as the lower division of the public four-year college, and it keeps taxes down.

It is noteworthy that the strongest advocates of the no-tuition policy have been the leaders of the professional associations, educational editors, and university professors of education, rather than the junior college administrators (Eells, 1941). Among these were Koos (1924), Eby (1927), Eells (1931), Bogue (1952), Gleazer (1968), Martorana (1952), Wattenbarger and Others (1973b), Thornton (1960). Notwithstanding the favorable gross statistics showing that a large percentage of the colleges did not charge tuition and these colleges enrolled a great majority of the students, qualms about the future of the no-tuition policy appear frequently in the writings of the leaders. From this study it will become obvious that the no-tuition policy outside California was not accepted or adopted in the majority of colleges. In fact, the concept of no-tuition was destined to abort early in its development. None of the nostrums available--resolutions, innumerable apologias and state and national policies affirming the right of the people to two years of free higher education--have been successful. Why they failed to save the no-tuition policy will become evident in the discussion on the causes for the steady increase in the average tuition charged in the public two-year colleges. Suffice it to say for the present that tuition spread among the colleges during periods of depression and prosperity; that tuition seemed to have no adverse effect on the growth of enrollment. The correlation between the growth of tuition and of enrollment has

been positive, although not necessarily implying a cause-effect relationship. The steady rise in tuition was affected more by attitude, lack of money because of straitened economic circumstances, and/or competition for public funds by other agencies. Enrollment increased in almost direct proportion to the increase in number of colleges. Neither prosperity nor depression had an adverse effect. The most serious declines in enrollment occurred during the World War II and Korean War periods. During depressions when tuition might be expected to have a serious adverse effect on enrollment, the opposite has been true. From 1930 to 1935 enrollment increased by more than 70 percent; from 1973 to 1975 by 13 percent.

Despite these facts it is reasonable to maintain that tuition and fees do affect enrollment. Empirical studies reviewed by the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education have shown that the amount of change in enrollment caused by a change in tuition "probably varies from one to three percent for every $100 change in tuition, depending on the type of institution, the family income of the student, and the amount of tuition charged by other institutions." It added "For almost all ranges of increased tuition, students in public four-year institutions are more responsive to tuition changes than students in public two-year colleges" because they include a larger percentage of undergraduates with incomes under $10,000 and because the absolute increase in tuition would be greater in four-year colleges than in two-year colleges (National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education, 1973, p. 311-312).

The Commission projected that changes would modestly affect enrollment in the two-year colleges. If and when tuition reached the $400 to $500 range the effect on enrollment would begin to approach that of the four-year colleges unless federal and state aid to students should increase enough to offset the tuition increases.

While the major thrust of the study is on the recent developments regarding the fate of the no-tuition policy, attention will be given to the early development, if only to show that the no-tuition debate emerged at the very beginning of the public junior college movement. One could hardly deduce from the heat generated by the no-tuition debate of the last five years that the public school no-tuition policy was never universally accepted by even a majority of the colleges.

This study is confined to two-year public colleges--community colleges, technical-vocational colleges, and area vocational and adult schools. In general branches of four year colleges and universities are not included, although some statistics do include them.

Only occasional comments will be made on the issues relating to the justification of tuition, the relative benefits of education to society and students, the use of tuition as a method redistribution of income, marginal and elasticity economic theories. An excellent short discussion of most of these issues is contained in Bowen and Servelle (1972) Who Benefits from Higher Education - and Who Should Pay?

Very early it was recognized that the distinction between tuition and fees is illogical particularly when fees are compulsory for all students. Consequently statistics often include compulsory fees as part of the student charges under the rubric "tuition and fees." Because tuition is more precisely defined than fees, it may be necessary at times to use it independently in the discussion. At such times the context will make this clear. Definitions of tuition and fees will follow this Introduction.

The disproportionate number and enrollment of California colleges skews the tuition averages toward the low side. For this reason Halstead (1975) excluded California colleges from his study.

After the definition of tuition and fees sections will be devoted to Tuition: Theory and Practice, Patterns of Tuition, Fees, The Statistical Evidence, a special section on The California Situation and Summary and Conclusion.

Tuition: Definition and Characteristics

As used in this study tuition is defined as a charge to students in partial payment for the cost of instruction. The proportion of the cost depends upon the student's classification: in-district or resident, out-of-district, out-of-state or nonresident, foreign. Subclassifications that influence the tuition charge include adult, evening, matriculated or non-matriculated, special.

Locally-controlled colleges apply all four major classifications, state-supported colleges have no need for the out-of-district classification.

Colleges in no-tuition states obviously omit the in-district students since tuition is defined "as a cost for non-resident students and shall be charged to out-of-county, out-of-state and foreign students" (State Board of Directors for Community Colleges of Arizona, 1975b, p. 13). The subclassifications are found in locally-controlled; state-supported colleges; in no-tuition and in tuition colleges.

Tuition is lowest for in-district, higher for out-of-district, and highest for out-of-state and foreign students. A few exceptions occur, however. Often, an out-of-district student's tuition is paid in whole or in part by his district of residence on a charge-back or interdistrict agreement. A few states have reciprocal arrangements permitting out-of-district, out-of-state or foreign students to register on the same basis as in-district students.

The 1972-73 Tuition Review of the Association of Community College Trustees reported for out-of-state students no tuition in Rhode Island, the same tuition as in-district students in South Carolina and Vermont.

In no-tuition California a student must get permission from the college in his home district before he may enroll in a college outside his district. The process is simplified if the colleges have a reciprocal arrangement. An out-of-county student residing in Arizona, but not in a community college district, is required to sign an affidavit as to his residency and after validation by the County Superintendent of Schools the County supervisors pay the tuition (State Board of Directors for Community Colleges of Arizona, 1975b).

Tuition for veterans, senior citizens, disadvantaged students, inmates of correctional institutions is often reduced or remitted in full. Foreign students sometimes are required to pay more than out-of-state students; occasionally less. Very often a quota is placed on the number of foreign and out-of-state students permitted to enroll.

Variations in tuition may also depend upon the students' courses or programs – college transfer, vocational-technical, apprenticeship, credit, no credit, state reimbursed. Since "summer programs are often self-supporting" . . . non-tuition colleges "charge tuition and fees as set by the State Board and the district governing boards" (State Board of Directors for Community Colleges of Arizona, 1975b, p. 13).

Apparently tuition has many meanings. They vary widely from statewide uniformity to complete local control. Although it would seem logical to expect statewide systems of two-year colleges to have uniform tuition the actual situation is otherwise. Florida permits each college to set its own tuition while Hawaii, Minnesota and Washington require that the colleges charge the same tuition. Locally-supported multi-campus districts usually have uniform tuition for the same or similar categories of programs — college transfer, vocational-technical, credit, no credit, etc.

Locally-controlled and tax-supported colleges are usually permitted to establish their own tuition within limits established by state law. In some states tuition is mandatory and must be at least the minimum set by the legislature Other states establish a maximum with no minimum. A common upper limit is one-third (or lower ratio) of the cost of instruction. States may also require that tuition be uniform for full-time and part-time students by requiring that the rate be based on credit- or contact-hour.

Until 1976 when tuition was introduced in New York City students who completed a degree program or who did not possess a high school diploma or its equivalent or who attended classes in the evening were required to pay tuition. To a limited extent California colleges charge adults enrolling in fewer than 10 credit hours. Two districts in tuition-free Arizona charge non-regular students (State Board of Directors for Community Colleges of Arizona, 1975a).

State policy almost invariably establishes tuition for community colleges at a lower rate than for four-year colleges and universities. Thus in Massachusetts a proposal for an increase in tuition for community colleges is set at $400, for state four-year colleges at $500 and for the University at $600 (Dwyer, 1975) and in Utah the comparable average tuitions are $269, $312 and $398 respectively (Losee, 1976).

Tuition: Theory and Practice

As was indicated in the Introduction there has always been a wide gap between the theory of no-tuition and the tuition practices in the various states. From time to time a few states and a large number of colleges have subscribed to the no-tuition policy in principle and in practice but in varying degrees all states and colleges have abandoned it. At no time have

many educators subscribed to the no-tuition policy as it exists in the elementary and secondary schools; even fewer are the educators who have not closed their eyes to the classroom practices of collecting fees for supplies and services when the college does not provide them. In only rare situations did a college not require students to buy his own texts and often buy student body membership. The fact that going to college involves a larger outlay of money than going to high school may be so ingrained in American life that fees, if not tuition, are considered and accepted as part of this outlay. Other reasons have been given for the failure of the no-tuition policy to take root, but they do not explain why the same reasons do not apply to the elementary and secondary schools. Also pertinent to an understanding of the failure of the no-tuition policy to gain widespread approval is that attendance has never been compulsory in higher education; presumably anyone who wished to attend did so primarily for the benefits such an education would bring to him.

Notwithstanding this long tradition the no- or low-tuition advocates keep insisting that free higher education is as necessary "for a fuller realization of democracy in every phase of living" as is the high school (Higher Education for American Democracy, 1947a, p. 8). They argue that "Nominal or free tuition seems to be necessary if junior colleges are truly to be democratized and made available to young people of all economic levels" (Eelis, 1941, p. 51). Yet at no time in the history of the junior college movement did the statistical record warrant their hope of a widespread acceptance of the no-tuition principle.

A look at the statistical long-term tuition and fees trend will bear out the thesis that the no-tuition policy has been more a dream than a reality; a dream that had more currency among the educational leaders and theorists than among two-year college administrators. In his pioneer study of the new public junior college Koos professor of education at the University of Minnesota was not pleased with the number that were being forced to charge tuition, primarily because the states and local communities would not support them. Yet, he believed that "Logic seems to point toward providing junior college education, which is essentially secondary in character, free of tuition to the student, and this, . . . argues for state aid (a) for residents in proportion to that current (b) for non-residents – full amount"

(Koos, 1924, p. 624). A few years later Professor Eby of the University of Texas was at a loss to understand the logic of giving "a child under twenty-one . . . free schooling in home high school," and in the state university away from home "but not in the home (junior) college" (1927, p. 10).

Professor Cubberley acknowledged that the theory for imposing student fees in higher education was "based rather on the need of the institution for additional funds than on any sound social reasoning or facts as to relative costs and values", but he added "that an equally good argument can be advanced for the assumption of such costs by society" (Eells, 1931, p. 534).

Despite the logic and the reasoning it was evident as early as 1930 that the principle of free tuition was not taking hold. Excluding California which maintained for its junior colleges a no-tuition policy almost as strict as that in the secondary schools, Eells' survey of tuition in 1929 showed a pattern of rising tuition similar to that reported by Arnett (p. 1) for the senior institutions. In 1929 72 junior colleges were charging tuition and 61 (including 33 California colleges) were not. In 46 or 35 percent of the total number of colleges tuition was $100 or more. However, the no-tuition colleges enrolled a much larger percentage of students, 21907 to 8906 for the tuition colleges or a ratio of 71.1 to 28.9. Of the 133 institutions, 46 were in 4 states in which no college charged tuition; 51 were in 9 states in which every college charged tuition, 36 in 6 states in which some charged and some did not.

Eleven years later the relationship between junior colleges not charging tuition and those charging tuition changed slightly in favor of the latter. Ninety-three or almost 40 percent of the public colleges spread over 18 states did not charge tuition, compared with 46 percent in 1929. The enrollment in the no-tuition colleges represented more than two-thirds of the total, down from the 71 percent in 1929 (Eells, 1941). Again, the 41 no-tuition California colleges exerted a strong statistical influence on the number and on the percentage of colleges and of students enrolled.

Eells, by then executive secretary of the American Association of Junior Colleges still the optimist was pleased with the spread among the states of no-tuition colleges but as we noted above he felt it necessary to remind his constituents about the necessity of free tuition in a democratic society.

Whatever hopes the leaders of the junior college movement had for a no-tuition policy began to fade during the 1940's. In 1940 Eells was surprised that only a small majority of 57 percent of the 1847 respondents replied affirmatively to the question, "Should publicly-controlled junior colleges be supported entirely by public funds with no charge for tuition to students – as in the public schools today?" (Eells, 1941, p. 82). Even among public junior college executives and city superintendents of schools only 55 and 54 percent respectively voted for no tuition. As might have been expected 78 percent of the private junior college, university and college presidents voted against free junior colleges. The strongest endorsement of free junior colleges came from labor union representatives with a 79 percent affirmative response, followed by editors with 65 percent and educational leaders with 64 percent (Eells, 1941).

Of respondents who voted against no tuition 656 indicated the amount they thought students should pay. Fifty percent of the cost of instruction should be borne by students was the opinion of 44.8 percent of respondents; another 18.6 percent believed it should be more than half the cost. The overall average percent of cost to the student was 46 (Eells, 1941). After analyzing the responses Eells observed:

> "In spite of our theory of free public education, particularly at the secondary level, and the practice in such progressive junior college states as California, Arizona, Kansas, and Mississippi, and to a lesser extent in a dozen or more other states, we find that the vote is distinctly unfavorable to complete support of public junior colleges by taxation with free tuition to the students" (1941, p. 82-83).

State legislation on tuition was no more encouraging to the no-tuition advocates. In his study of legislative enactments of 1940 Martorana (1952) found that tuition was mandatory in Idaho, optional in nine states, a prerequisite for state aid in Texas, could not be charged without permission of the State Board in Florida, and could not be more than one-third of the cost of operation and maintenance in New York.

Despite the evidence Bogue, executive director of the American Association of Junior Colleges remained hopeful that "junior colleges would be as free in other states as they are in California" and although he did not know "how long it will take to reach the goal of free public education

through the fourteenth year" he saw many signs pointing in that direction (1950, p. 95). Among these signs were the prediction of the President's Commission on Higher Education "that community colleges would in the future serve the needs of the people in much the same manner as high schools do today" (Bogue, 1950, p. 95), the unanimous approval for the extension of free public education by the National Council of Chief State School Officers and legislation in Florida, New York and Texas moving in the direction of tuition-free education. He was certain that the history of the junior colleges in "established institutions and states provides results rewarding and satisfying enough to the people so they are determined to share the costs by community cooperation for its continuation" (Bogue, 1950, p. 95).

Martorana was far from optimistic about the future of the no-tuition policy. Bluntly, he wrote that:

> "Contrary to the stated philosophy of many public community colleges that they seek to bring free or practically free, education to their clientele, common practice is to charge tuition or general fees of students attending" (1952, p. 22).

The response to Eells' poll and Martorana's findings in his survey of state laws reflect in part what the President's Commission on Higher Education called the long American tradition of heavy dependence "upon the student and his family for support of institutions of higher education through the payment of tuition and other required fees" (Higher Education for American Democracy, 1947b, p. 33). The tradition was only temporarily broken with the emergence of public institutions particularly the land grant colleges. By 1948 the President's Commission on Higher Education noted that state supported institutions had been "moving away from the principle of free education to a much greater degree than is commonly supposed" (Higher Education for American Democracy, 1947a, p. 28).

Periodically, tuition and fees become major national issues. Such was the case in the late 1960s when discussion centered on vouchers, deferred payment through loans and other proposals and again, in 1973 following the publication of The Management and Financing of Colleges by the Committee for Economic Development (1973) and Priorities for Action by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (1973). In both periods the emphasis was on having students pay all or a large share of the costs of instruction partly

to close the gap between tuition in the private and public institutions and partly to require those who profit from education to pay for it. Never too far below the surface of the discussion was the funding gap between income and expenditures caused by the deterioration of the economy.

The 1973 publications attracted considerable attention for two reasons: one, the prestigiousness of the sponsors and two, the revival of the earlier plans advocating that students as the direct beneficiaries of education should pay the full or major cost of their education either with their own funds or through loans. From the educators reaction one can speculate that they considered these attacks a more serious threat to the no- or low-tuition than any heretofore launched.

At first both plans included community colleges but after considerable criticism the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (1974) issued a revised report, Tuition: A Supplemental Statement, clarifying and reaffirming its no or low-tuition position for community colleges. The CED made no change in its report resting its case on its recommendation that for two-year community and technical colleges the increase be phased over ten years instead of five stipulated for the senior public colleges. To bring tuition and fees up to approximately 50 percent of the cost of instructional costs would require an increase of $426 over the ten year period using 1969-70 average charges of $187 as a base (Committee for Economic Development, 1973). Today, a tuition and fees charge of $613 ($187 plus $426) does not seem as unreasonable as it did in October of 1973. For 1975-76 the estimated average is $320, with many colleges in the $400-$600 range (American Assoc. of Com. and Junior Colleges, 1976b).

Reaction to the two documents came fast. Under the leadership of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) professional organizations including the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and state community college associations, the National Student Association, the AFL-CIO, issued statements or passed resolutions attacking the proposals to hike tuition. Critical editorials appeared in newspapers in every part of the country, as well as in the Wall Street Journal and Christian Science Monitor. To the state capitals educators sent pleas for at least maintaining the status quo on tuition; realizing of course,

that in the financial situation affecting most states anything more than a freeze on tuition would gain little active support.

The campaign as measured by "clips and comments on tuition and financing" was a success. The AASCU distributed a collection about 50 "newspaper articles, statements from national labor and political leaders, and editorial comments . . . with the hope that it will serve as a useful tool for state college and university presidents and chancellors who are presenting their own case for public financial support" (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1973). The AASCU position is that "wherever possible state and local governments should provide zero-tuition higher education as in the state colleges and community colleges of California, the City University of New York and the community colleges of Chicago." Instead of increasing tuition it encourages states "to decrease tuition wherever possible" (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1974, p. 1).

The Association of Community and Junior Colleges as part of the consortium embraced by the AASCU endorsed the statement. However, although it has with varying degrees of enthusiasm advocated the no-tuition principle it has not been the leader in this struggle. It has passed resolutions and exhorted its members to keep tuition within bounds, but the Association's members have not followed the advice either because they do not agree with it, they have no choice being bound by state laws or financial survival depends on tuition.

The AASCU campaign had little observable effect on the rising trend of the number of colleges giving up the no-tuition policy and the number that increased tuition and fees. In fact, within the year that the AASCU statement appeared the City Colleges of Chicago abandoned its no-tuition policy, the City University of New York's low-fee policy gave way to tuition as the City sought means to avoid near bankruptcy and the California colleges were forced to increase their fees. If the California State Department of Finance has its way the community colleges in 1976 will be required to impose tuition or fees on student services non-credit classes and community services activities (see the chapter on the California Situation).

It should be noted that much of the concern over the rise of tuition and fees applies primarily to students enrolled in the day credit programs.

There is less concern or opposition to imposing tuition on students in non-credit or community service classes and activities, offered mainly in the evening hours. Very often no explanation seems necessary to justify such tuition or fees; it being understood that these students are wage earners and therefore able to pay. In addition the courses they enroll in are considered to be primarily for their benefit and remotely of benefit to society. Similarly, tuition is charged during the summer session. Often, state laws or regulations require that such courses or activities be self-supporting. In the New York City community colleges the no-tuition policy (not the fees policy) applied only to those who matriculated as regular students. All others, mostly evening division and summer session students paid tuition. In California students who are 21 years of age or older and who enroll in fewer than 10 units may be required to pay tuition. Most of these are also evening division students. In Arizona, a no-tuition state, seven of the nine districts imposed summer session tuition of $12 or $15 per semester hour in the academic year 1975-76 (State Board of Directors for Community Colleges of Arizona, 1975a).

Based on what has happened throughout the history of the junior-community college educators have been fighting a rearguard action to prevent a rapid escalation of tuition and fees rather than mounting a frontal campaign to seek lower or zero-tuition. Today (1976), the economic situation affecting many states and cities is so serious that few, if any, educators can expect tuition and fees to be abolished. Even a freeze on the present tuition and fees is unrealistic. The issue is not should tuition be imposed or increased but when or how much. The New York City financial debacle is only the most serious of a growing number of similar situations throughout the country. These include Hawaii, Illinois, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Virginia, Washington. For example, in October of 1975 Illinois was short of cash to pay its bills ("Illinois Behind in Paying Bills; 'Crisis' is Denied," 1975), New Jersey cut the community college budget by 28 percent and the Governors of Virginia and Missouri ordered a five percent cut in their respective binennium budget. Many of the cities, states, and college districts were unable to sell bonds or had to pay unusually high interest rates. Their tax-exempt status lost a good deal of its appeal as the financial community became wary of defaults.

Paradoxically, success in attracting students helped bring about the present financial crisis and the revival of interest in tuition, because the new wave of enrollments in the 1970's comparable to the previous surge of the 1950's and early 1960's was not matched by higher appropriations or by the expected student or public pressure on legislators to provide more funds. Whatever pressure has developed has been toward reducing expenditures. Reflecting the taxpayers' mood legislators are unsympathetic or hostile to the educators' claims that the increase in enrollment demonstrates the hunger of the population for education. They are particularly suspicious of the unprecedented rise of enrollments in adult education, challenging the quality of education being offered on the campus and in the many off-campus locations. They are asking what would have been unthinkable during the 1950's and early 1960's: "Are we educating too many people?" In his Report to the Carnegie Corporation Alan Pifer its president succinctly expressed the changing public mood toward higher education. He wrote: "Like many other institutions these days, higher education has become the object of widespread skepticism. After an era of unprecedented growth, affluence and exalted status in the 1960's, it stands very much on the defensive. No longer is it assured of the unquestioning public regard and financial support it once enjoyed. Increasingly, doubts are being voiced as to whether its benefits are not outweighed by its costs and burdens" (1975, p. 3).

It is doubtful that the extensive discussion on the merits of no- or low-tuition has had any significant effect on the tuition trend in public colleges and universities. The most that can be said about the results of the discussion is that tuition might be higher had no discussion taken place. Much more influential in shaping tuition policy have been various economic and social forces.

Today, the overriding rationale for raising tuition and/or fees is the need for revenue at the state and local level. The arguments about the relative benefits of higher education to the student and to society are muted, absent, or used in a desultory fashion. As William G. Dwyer, President of the Massachusetts Board of Regional Community Colleges wrote "There is a great deal of pressure for another increase in tuition, since the state is looking for all possible sources of increased income" (Dwyer, 1975). Even in California there is more open discussion on modifying the

no-tuition policy than at any time since 1907 when the first junior college was established. At the Fall 1975 and Winter 1976 state meetings of the California Academic Senate, the California Association of Community and Junior Colleges and the Association of California Community College Administrators the probability of tuition was openly discussed. There seemed to be consensus that unless the state fiscal situation improved, the Governor would propose that tuition be charged. In the proposals for rescuing New York City from default the imposition of tuition is nearly always included. The first step toward the tuition policy was a 25 to 50 percent increase in the semester consolidated fees in the various community colleges.

The major impetus for raising or imposing tuition comes from the state capitals, though administrators are not averse to increasing them on their own initiative. However, administrators feel more comfortable in raising tuition if they can point to public pressure, legislation or state board regulations as the reason for doing so.

The dilemma confronting legislators and administrators was expressed by Representative William C. Andrews of Florida who told a community college group that he favored free college-level education but such a policy "would not be feasible at this time." The reality as he put it is: "If it's a matter of paying higher fees or not having an education, then fees should be increased" (Florida Association of Community Colleges, 1975, p. 3). The Council of Presidents of the City University of New York came to a similar conclusion when it receded from its position for free tuition and open admission because these principles cannot "be maintained along with the fundamental principle of academic excellence in the light of current and future budget reductions . . . " (Magarrell, 1975, p. 4). What turned out to be the final word on this century old tradition was Governor Carey's pledge to do his best to preserve the system of free tuition which he defined to mean "that those who cannot afford to pay should not have to do so" (Peterson, 1975, p. 32).

Arizona, technically a tuition-free state, may also be forced by the realities of economics to resort to tuition to help support the community colleges. The State Community College Board "must consider drastic changes in financing to handle the problem" of educating the increasing number of community college students. Arnold Jeffers, chairman of the State Board

played the popular dual role-personal opposition to tuition followed by an admission that tuition may be something "that we'll be forced into" (California Community and Junior College Association, 1976a, p. 4).

The economic pressures that are forcing colleges to increase tuition and fees may be illustrated by the situation that confronted the Metropolitan Community College District of Kansas City, Missouri. The legislature appropriate $18.5 million in state aid for all of the state's two-year colleges but this was cut to $18 million by a mandatory three percent freeze cut. The $18 million budget was further reduced by $1.5 million to make up for the previous year's underfunding. To further complicate the funding problem a larger-than-anticipated state enrollment rise of 25.9 percent forced a cut in the state funding from $20 per credit hour to $12.53 per credit hour. As a result the District was forced to raise tuition twice: in September 1975 from $9 to $11 per credit hour with a semester maximum of $132 and in February when the maximum was removed (Metropolitan Community Colleges, 1976).

This, then, is the tuition situation in 1976. Outside California free tuition for resident day students is non-existent, unless we consider compulsory fees of $50 and up per semester as inconsequential. If we include compulsory fees for parking and health and tuition for resident evening adults many California colleges are sliding into the tuition group.

Patterns of Tuition

The most common tuition patterns are: 1) semester or quarter rate for full-time students plus a credit hour rate for part-time students and 2) uniform credit hour rate for all students. Under the former the full-time semester or quarter rate may be for 15 or 12 credit hours; the part-time rate applies to a student enrolled for 1 to 14 or 1 to 11 credit hours respectively. The full-time rate when calculated on a per-hour basis is usually lower than the part-time rate; For example at the Metropolitan Community Colleges in Kansas City, Missouri the semester rate for Fall 1975 was $132 for a full-time load of 12 or more credit hours and $11 per credit hour for part-time students enrolling in fewer than 12 hours. The full-time rate converts to $8.80 per hour rate for a normal 15-hour program. It is obvious that the full-time rate favors the full-time student. It also acts as

an incentive for the student to enroll in more than 12 or 15 credit hours at no extra cost and a temptation for administrators to encourage them to do so since state subsidies are often awarded on the number of credit hours generated. For the Spring 1976 semester the Metropolitan district adopted a uniform per credit-hour rate for all students raising the semester cost for a 15-hour program to $165 (Metropolitan Community Colleges, 1976). In the Iowa Davenport Area colleges the full-time rate for 1973-74 was $405 per year; the part-time rate for Adult College Parallel was $19.50 per semester hour which converts to $585 on a full-time basis (Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, 1974).

Before the growth of part-time student enrollments the full-time tuition rate did not cause too much concern since not many part-time students were involved. Moreover, most of them worked and were enrolled in evening classes. But, today when part-time students are enrolled in day as well as in evening classes and greatly outnumber full-time students the practice of charging them a higher credit-hour rate than full-time students is being questioned.

Several state committees and commissions have recommended that tuition and fee structures should not discriminate against part-time students choosing to combine or alternate education with other experience such as work or travel (California Legislature, 1973). The Council on Higher Education (Washington) recommended "that efforts be made to reduce or eliminate the inequities in charges to part-time students" (1974, p. 1), and the Ohio Board of Regents made a similar recommendation but added a second recommendation that legislation to effect the change be requested when budget costs involved can be met (Ohio Board of Regents, 1975).

It does not follow from these recommendations that tuition for part-time students will be lowered. Under pressure now existing to have students pay a larger share of the cost of instruction the trend is toward raising the amount paid by full-time students to the equivalent of that paid by part-time students (Council on Higher Education, 1974).

The movement toward a per-credit-hour tuition rate is well-established. The more recent legislation on tuition usually sets a minimum per credit hour rate; often also a maximum. Colleges in states that permit either full-time or uniform per credit hour rates also are leaning toward the

latter (Education Commission of the States, 1975). Among the states charging per credit-hour rates for all students are Illinois, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, and Nevada.

Oregon colleges are permitted to establish in-district quarter rates inversely related to the distance from the students' home to the campus. Example, at Lane Community College a student living within 29 miles of the campus pays $100 per quarter, within 30-39 miles $80, 40-49 miles $70, and beyond 50 miles $60. A similar system prevails at Chemeketa Community College (Oregon Board of Education, 1975).

In technical-vocational, adult education, and the new mini-term programs tuition may be charged for the number of contact hours in attendance. Thus in the Iowa Area schools contact hour rates are charged those enrolled in General Adult and Continuing Classes, career supplementary classes, and adult college parallel classes. The contact hour rates during 1973-74 varied from 25 cents to 90 cents. In another variation of contact-hour tuition the rates varied from $2 for 2-5 hours to $14 for 41-50 hours. In excess of 50 hours the rates were determined on an individual basis (Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, 1974).

Fees

Of importance in assessing the extent of costs of education to students are fees. Whereas tuition is considered primarily a charge for instruction, fees are charged for services presumably only peripherally related to instruction. Another distinction between tuition and fees is that the former is normally assessed against all students while most fees are assessed for particular services rendered to or required by some but not all students. However, some fees are compulsory for all students and may be recurrent each term students are enrolled or at the beginning or at the end of the regular two-year (or equivalent) period of attendance.

For fees that are voluntary, discretionary with the student or applicable for a service required by some and not by others the distinction between them and tuition, which is invariably compulsory, has justification; but for most fees that are compulsory for all the distinction can only be made by stretching the definition.

Unlike tuition, fees are uniform for all students, in-district,

out-of-state, and foreign. To a lesser extent than with tuition state legislatures or state boards have limited the amount that may be charged.

Classification

Fees defy easy classification. There are an innumerable array, sometimes exceeding 50 different items. Most frequently a distinction is made between required fees for institutional services to all students and optional fees for services not required by every student. As with so many classification schemes the distinction is not uniform for all colleges. Some required fees in one college are optional in others. An example is the health insurance fee. In most of the studies and surveys on average tuition and fees the charges include only the required fees.

Both the required and optional fees have a variety of subclassifications. Among these that may be required of all students are fees for:

1. Application, admission, matriculation, registration, aptitude tests.
2. Graduation and diploma.
3. Student activities, health, service on revenue bonds (interest and redemption) for student-related buildings and other capital outlays.
4. Library.

Among those that are optional or required for a special service or activity are fees for:

1. Laboratory, field trips, use of music practice room, models in life drawing, culinary arts, flying, swimming, canoeing, skiing, golf, bowling, equitation, scuba diving, etc.;
2. Change of program, late registration, special examination, library fines, graduation in absentia;
3. Special services, parking, health, insurance;
4. Dormitory.

Fees may represent 100 percent of the total charges in colleges that are prohibited from charging tuition or a small fraction in colleges that are strictly limited in the number of fees and the amount they may charge. Arizona colleges are representative of the former. Strictly limited are the South Carolina colleges which are prohibited from charging "separate laboratory, supply or consumable materials fees for credit courses," and

accident insurance, although students in specialized programs may be assessed an additional fee for liability insurance (Garrison, 1976). In between are the colleges in Utah whose fees averaged $89 in 1974-75 and $101 in 1975-76 or about 62 percent of the tuition (Losee, 1976) and the colleges in Washington whose fees may not exceed $124.50, a sum equal to the yearly tuition (Terrey, 1976). So extensive are the range and variety of fees charged by Maryland colleges they are not included in the annual Selected Statistical Data issued by the Maryland State Board for Community Colleges (1972).

Impact on Open Access

Voluntary fees may have as great an impact on open access as tuition, because they are so high that they effectively bar low-income students from enrolling in a wide range of programs and courses in art, aviation, engineering, music, science and technical-vocational areas. The large class fees sometimes exceeding $1000, plus the cost of supplies, instruments and tools on top of tuition and other general fees make it extremely unlikely that low-income students will enroll in these courses. When assessing the effect of tuition and fees on access the effect of this group of fees must be considered; particularly when the question of the community college's role as an instrument of upward mobility is under discussion. The courses and programs requiring such large fees are in many cases those that lead to the prestigious and/or higher paying professions and technical jobs. The inability of low-income students to pay such fees may in part account for their low enrollment in such courses. Fees for such physical education classes as canoeing, skiing, golf, bowling, equitation, scuba diving also restrict the opportunities of low-income students, widening the social gap between them and high-income students.

If we take into account the compulsory fees, whether by regulation or subterfuge, there would be no two-year colleges in the no-tuition ranks. In fact, in some states where tuition and fees are loosely regulated, the annual fees imposed by some colleges are higher than the tuition imposed by other colleges.

The Statistical Evidence

No matter what measure is used nor how the studies have been made they show two major trends: Tuition and fees are rising; more colleges each year abandon the no-tuition ranks. These trends attest the strong pressure on community college educators to pass on to students part of the cost of their instruction. This pressure is exerted by legislatures and state boards and indirectly by the effects of inflation on revenues. Only the commitment to the open door and the competition for students among the various segments of higher education prevent a more rapid rise in tuition and the complete abandonment of the no-tuition principle.

The most widely used indicators of the national trends in tuition and fees are analyses showing:

1. The yearly average of tuition and fees for all colleges.
2. The number of colleges charging tuition and fees on a scale of $0, $1 to $99, $100 to $199 etc.
3. The proportion of income by colleges or states derived from tuition and fees.

The results obtained from each of these indicators will be treated separately.

Yearly Average Tuition and Fees

Basic to all studies of tuition and fees is the yearly average. Although the average for any year varies depending upon the data base and the statistical measure used the general upward trend is confirmed by each study. Regionally, tuition and fees have been highest in the North Atlantic states followed by the Great Lakes and Plains, the Southeast, and the West and Southwest. In 1963-64, for example, the median charges were $314, $124, $107 and $68 respectively; with a national median of $128 (Simon and Grant, 1965). A similar pattern was reported by the President's Commission on Higher Education for 1932, 1940 and 1947. The differences among the regions are related to the number of independent colleges in the regions.

Among the early studies Eells (1931) reported that in 1929 the range of tuition was from $0 to $200; the average in the tuition states was from $17 to $180. For 1951 Hackett (1954) reported tuition from $0 to $300 and up with a median range of $50-$74.

TABLE I. TUITION AND FEES TWO-YEAR AND FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES FISCAL YEARS 1961-1975

	Yearly Averages															% Total Increase	% Average Yearly Increase	
	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975		1962-1975	
Two-Year Colleges		88	97	97	99	109	121	143	170	188	207	222	242	261	263		199	14
Four-Year Colleges		182	192	215	224	240	259	268	281	308	337	361	394	420	458		152	12
Percent Two-Year of Four-Year Colleges		48	51	45	44	45	47	53	60	61	61	61	61	62	57			

Sources: For 1962-1972: Simon and Frankel, 1973, p. 114-115. (National Center for Educational Statistics)
For 1973-1975: Grant and Lind, 1975, p. 113.

																	1971-1975	
Two-Year Colleges											168	185	200	251	287		71	18
Four-Year Colleges											395	439	465	498	541		37	9
Percent Two-Year of Four-Year Colleges											43	42	43	50	53			

Source: Scully, 1975, p. 1. (Adapted from College Scholarship Service)

																	1961-1975	
Two-Year Colleges	167						237							319	337		102	7
Four-Year Colleges	175						287							450	488		179	13
Percent Two-Year of Four-Year Colleges	95						83							71	69			

Source: Halstead, 1975, p. 102.

The average institutional charges for full-time resident degree students compiled by the National Center for Educational Statistics (Simon and Frankel, 1973) and its predecessors have risen from $88 in 1961-62 to $263 in 1974-75 for an annual average increase of 14 percent (Table I). Since 1970-71 the increase has dropped to an annual average of 7 percent. Another national study by the College Scholarship Service reports an 18 percent annual increase for the 1970-71 to 1974-75 period from $168 to $287 (Scully, 1975). By excluding colleges in California, New York City and those with fewer than 1000 students Halstead estimated tuition of $337 in 1966-67 and 337 in 1974-75 (Halstead, 1975).

The National Center and the College Scholarship Service data (Table I) indicate that the charges in the two-year colleges increased at a higher annual rate than those for the four-year colleges, 14 percent to 12 percent respectively for the former and 18 percent to 12 percent respectively for the latter (Simon and Frankel, 1973; Scully, 1975). Halstead's figures point in the opposite direction, 13 percent for the four-year colleges to 7 percent for the two-year colleges (Halstead, 1975). The most recent survey on tuition sponsored by the Association of Community College Trustees (1976) reported that tuition and fees increased by 29 percent from 1975-76 to 1976-77 and by 130 percent from 1970-71 to 1976-77, increases larger than those for other segments of higher education.

Another indicator of trends is the percentage the two-year tuition and fees is of the four-year tuition and fees. From 1962 to 1975 the percentage obtained from the National Center data went from 48 percent to 57 percent. The 1975 figures show a drop of 5 percentage points from the 62 percent of 1974. Except for 1975 the National Center percentage was 60 percent or more since 1969. Lower percentage, 42 to 53, were derived from the College Scholarship data for 1971 to 1975.

The Halstead (1975) percentages show a steady drop from almost parity at 95 percent in 1961 to 82 percent in 1967, 71 percent in 1974 and 69 percent in 1975 (Table I).

From the trends observed in the three studies cited tuition and fees in the two-year colleges are approaching 60 percent of those charged in the four-year colleges. Although there is some sentiment, in New York and Ohio, for example, to adopt uniform rates for all lower division students in the

public colleges, the present practice of lower tuition in the two-year colleges will probably continue.

Another indicator of trends is the change in the annual tuition and fees by states. From 1965 to 1970 Wattenbarger and Others (1973a) reported increases in 29 states, decreases in 6, and no changes in 14. A review of tuition only by the Association of Community College Trustees reported that from 1971-72 to 1972-73 in 27 states in-state tuition remained the same and in 21 it increased. One state, South Dakota, did not have a two-year college and in two states it was not possible to determine any change. Only one state, California reported no tuition (Association of Community College Trustees, 1973).

Low, Moderate, High, Very High Tuition

Second to studies of yearly average tuition and fees are studies showing the range of tuition and fees during selected years based on the number of colleges charging the various ranges. Eells' study mentioned above (p. 1) was one of the first to list the number of colleges and the range of tuition. Since then other investigators have followed a similar pattern. (The early studies by Eells and Hackett listed in Table II were adopted to fit into the pattern widely used today.) In general these studies show that until 1968 the number of colleges that did not charge tuition increased although their percentage of total decreased. After 1968 the number also decreased. Visually, it can be observed that the top range rose slowly during the pre-1960 era but at a faster pace since. The median range moved up slowly from $1-$99 in 1929, to $100-$199 in 1960 and to $200-$299 in 1975.

By grouping the data into four categories – Low-Tuition, 0 to $99; Moderate Tuition, $100 to $299; High Tuition, $300 to $499; and Very High Tuition $500 and up – it becomes clear that the majority of colleges have charged low or moderate tuition and fees. However, the data for 1968 and 1975 show that the two-year colleges are moving away from the Low-Tuition policy. Through 1960 the Low-Tuition percentage remained above 90. In 1968 the percentage went down to 79 and in 1975 to 56 percent.

Conversely through 1960 the colleges that charged more than $300 was very small, three percent in 1951, five percent in 1956 and eight percent in 1960. Since then the rise in percentage has been steep – 21 in 1968

TABLE II. NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF PUBLIC TWO-YEAR COLLEGES CHARGING TUITION AND FEES SELECTED YEARS FALL 1929-1975

	1929		1951		1956		1960		1968		1975	
Tuition	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
0	61	46	104	39	112	36	121	36	133	18	59	6
$ 1 - $ 99	70	53	81	30	77	25	39	12	91	13	88	9
$100 - $199			65	24	86	28	118	35	196	27	133	14
$200 - $299	2	1	10	4	17	6	34	10	156	21	247	26
$300 - $399			7	3	4	1	11	3	90	12	174	19
$400 - $499					0	0	16	5	60	8	104	11
$500 - $599					11	4	0	0	8	1	63	7
$600 - $699											37	4
$700 and up											37	4
Total	133	100	267	100	307	100	339	100	734	100	942	100
Median Range	1-99		1-99		1-99		100-199		100-299		200-299	
Sources:	Eells (1931)		Hackett (1954)		Huther (1971)		Huther (1971)		Huther (1971)		AACJC (1975)	

TABLE III. PERCENTAGE OF PUBLIC TWO-YEAR COLLEGES CHARGING LOW, MODERATE, HIGH, VERY HIGH TUITION AND FEES SELECTED YEARS FALL 1951-1975

		1951	1956	1960	1968	1975
		%	%	%	%	%
Less than $100	Low	69	61	48	31	16
$100 to $299	Moderate	28	34	45	48	40
$300 to $499	High	3	1	8	20	29
$500 up	Very High		4	0	1	15

Sources: See Table II

and 44 in 1975. Part of the steep rise may be accounted for by the inclusion of the two-year branches of universities in the American Association of Community, Junior, and Technical College directories. The trend that shows up in the 1968 and 1975 data and the 1976 indications of continued tuition increases mean that the two-year colleges are abandoning the no- or low-tuition policy. It is safe to predict that by 1980 the majority of colleges will be charging more than $300 in tuition and fees. Even taking into consideration inflation the $300 to $500 yearly charges cannot be classified as other than high.

From an analysis of the data for 1974-75 taken from Tables I and II of the 1975 Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory, it was found that:

1. In the majority of colleges in Arizona, California, Hawaii, Louisiana, North Carolina and the District of Columbia tuition and required fees amounted to less than $200 per year. The Fall 1974 enrollment in the states and the District of Columbia was about one million or just less than one-third the total enrollment for all colleges.
2. In every state one or more colleges charged tuition and/or required fees.
3. In the majority of colleges in 24 states tuition and required fees amounted to $300 or more.
4. In the majority of colleges in Iowa, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania tuition and required fees were $400 or more. The Fall 1974 enrollment in all of the states' colleges was approximately 523 thousand.
5. In 19 states one or more colleges charged $500 or more.

Student Charges as a Source of College Income

Deciding what proportion of the support of the colleges should come from the students has been an issue from the earliest years of the movement. The proportion has varied from none to 100 percent. Some state laws place a limit of one-third; others influence the proportion by setting minimum and/or maximum limits on the amount of tuition and less frequently on the amount of fees that may be charged. At all times a strong influence on the size of the student proportion are the changes in support that come from property taxes, state allocations and federal aid. The proportion of college income from students fluctuates inversely to the proportion derived from one or more of the three public sources. Thus California and Hawaii

colleges that receive almost all income from public sources derive not more than one or two percent from students.

Since the data base varies from one year to the next one cannot be precise about comparisons. Moreover, some of the studies report averages by colleges, others by states; others use medians. Most include tuition from all students, in-district and out-of-state. Consequently, some non-tuition states and colleges show a small percentage derived from tuition and fees mainly from out-of-state students and from interdistrict payments from counties or districts that do not operate colleges. Where the statistics are based on students the no-tuition states influence the averages and medians, primarily because of the very large enrollments in the California colleges. For these and other reasons the averages reported by the various studies differ more widely than those for the other indices discussed. As a result of these factors the estimates of income derived from students do not reveal as significant a trend over the years as do the statistics that deal with average charges.

During the formative years of the public junior college movement student fees were the major source of income for many colleges. In 1929 the 16 Texas colleges derived 77 percent of their income from students; for 8 of them they were their sole source (Eells, 1931). For 30 colleges, probably in the central region of the country, Green "reported an average of 49 percent of the revenue to be secured from student tuition" (1929, p.180). As late as 1937-38 students' fees comprised 100 percent of financial support in the four colleges of Florida, Indiana, and Washington. In the 32 colleges of Iowa, Massachusetts and New Jersey students' fees represented from 74 percent to 90 percent of the support. The median for the 29 states was 32 percent, for the 206 colleges it was 22 percent (Starrak and Hughes, 1948). The President's Commission on Higher Education (Higher Education for American Democracy, 1947b) for 1932, reported 18 percent for 1940 and 19 percent for 1947. In a 1954 study Starrak and Hughes estimated that colleges received from students 6 percent of their income in 1918, 14 percent in 1930, 11 percent in 1942 and 9 percent in 1950 (Wattenbarger and others, 1973a). Martorana in a 1967 report for the Education Commission of the States found a median of 20 percent in 29 states that responded to his request for information (Gleazer, 1968). Spencer (1972a, 1972b) found the

same percentage in a survey of 15 states in 1971, 19 percent for operation income and one percent for capital outlay expenditures.

The percentage of income from tuition and fees has been affected by federal policy. Shortly after the end of World War II the percentage derived from student fees rose to 52.4 percent in 1946-47, 18.6 percent directly from students and 23.8 percent from the federal government (Higher Education for American Democracy, 1947b). In 1950 Starrak and Hughes reported that 13.5 percent of student fees came from the federal government in addition to the 9 percent from the students (Wattenbarger and Others, 1973a).

The conclusion that may be drawn from the various reports is that tuition and fees represent from less than one percent of income in low tuition colleges to 33 percent in high tuition colleges charging $500 or more with an overall average of 15 to 20 percent. The average is likely to go higher as tuition and fees increase and especially as colleges in California, Hawaii and in cities such as Chicago and New York resort more heavily to student fees for income. If continued and broadened, as seems likely, federal policy of awarding grants to students will accelerate the upward movement, since colleges will impose or increase tuition and fees in order to participate in the distribution of such aid.

This discussion can be summed up in the observation of the President's Commission that is as true in 1976 as it was in 1947. The Commission observed:

> "Student fees are flexible means of increasing income. This fact, in addition to the increasing pressure for more adequate funds, has undoubtedly been a major cause in the continuing and recently sharp increase in the rate of dependence of institutions upon funds from this source of financing operating expenditures" (Higher Education for American Democracy, 1947b, p. 33).

The California Situation

Since the California no-tuition policy has been singled out by nearly all advocates of free tuition as the ideal model, some remarks concerning this deserved reputation are appropriate. As with many other junior colleges the California colleges emerged from the secondary schools and for years, remained part of a unified (elementary, secondary) or high school district. A few are still associated with such a district. As part of

secondary education the junior colleges were subject to the laws applicable to high schools, including free tuition.

The no-tuition and low fees policies coupled with the large number of colleges and high enrollments tended to skew national averages on the low side. In recent years the distortion has become less pronounced as the percentage of California colleges and percentages of students dropped (Table IV). It will become even less so as the proportion of colleges and students becomes smaller and as the colleges charge more and higher fees.

Like other college educators the California two-year college educators did not subscribe to the public school meaning of free tuition. When necessary they found ways of imposing fees for laboratory or other classes that required equipment, supplies or help not provided in the budget. The most widespread deviation from the free tuition policy was in the imposition of a semester student activities fee of $5 to $10 to support athletics, various student activities, and department activities in theater arts, music,

TABLE IV. COLLEGES AND ENROLLMENTS
CALIFORNIA AND UNITED STATES
1929 - 1975

Year	Colleges		Calif. as percent of U.S.	Enrollment		Calif. as percent of U.S.
	Calif.	U.S.	2 ÷ 3	Calif.	U.S.	5 ÷ 6
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1929	33	133	25	13,000	31,000	42
1944	56	260	22	166,000	260,000	64
1961	68	426	16	318,000	645,000	49
1970	94	872	11	716,000	2,316,000	31
1975	103	1014	10	1,114,000	3,922,000	28

Sources:

For 1929: Eells, 1931, p. 524.
For 1944: Starrak and Hughes, 1948, p. 23.
For 1961: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1963, p. 27-28.
For 1970: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1972, p. 91.
For 1975: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1976a, p. 96.

forensic, lectures, etc. From student fees some administrators exacted an allotment for special functions and entertainment of visitors. Concerning the practice Dr. Bogue executive secretary of the American Association of Junior Colleges remarked a little naively:

> "Education in California through the fourteenth year is completely free, but by a sort of gentleman's agreement, student fees are paid for student activities. Payment cannot be required legally, but by general understanding and student acceptance, social pressure usually operates effectively" (1952, p. 9).

There was more than social pressure on the student to pay the fee. A student who demurred at paying the fee that was collected during the registration process, was required to see the dean of students or his representative to explain why he would not pay the fee. While he was doing so, registration continued and classes filled. This was pressure enough. In addition, the student was placed in the awkward position of standing on his legal rights or in the demeaning position of pleading his inability to pay. Before 1948 there was little open resistance to the fee but by 1960 student opposition was so strong that many colleges modified or eliminated the compulsory feature of collecting the fee.

Administrative reaction to this development was to importune (unsuccessfully) the legislature to permit students in each college to vote on the issue of a compulsory student body fee, a course that seemed illogical for those favoring no-tuition and a dangerous precedent for similar legislative action.

For a time there was a question as to the legality of requiring students to buy their textbooks but this doubt was resolved by legislation, although a wealthy district or two continued to provide textbooks on a loan basis. In the area of laboratory fees various stratagems were employed by some colleges to circumvent the free tuition law. Deposits on equipment, class fees for breakage or for hiring models in art classes were collected through the student store, the bursar's office or less frequently by the instructor.

From time to time the educators sponsored or had imposed on them legislation to charge fees for health; parking; physical education classes in such off-campus facilities as bowling alleys, golf courses, riding academies

and flying fields; adult education classes and community services activities. In 1963 the legislature for the first time required colleges to collect tuition from out-of-state students. In the same year "governing boards were given the authority to construct student centers, bookstores, health facilities, and parking facilities and lease them to the associated student governments . . ." (Toews, 1964, p. 23).

A 1973-74 survey with 88 out of 98 colleges responding disclosed that residents' student body membership fees were required by 81 colleges, adult fees by 42, health fees by 47; parking fees by 29, community services fees for community events and classes by 26. Average semester fees ranged from $1.75 to $8 for physical education classes conducted in non-district facilities; and about $25 for adult education and community services classes. Although not mentioned in the survey since few colleges were affected students in flying, scuba diving, horseback riding and other classes usually pay fees many times higher than $25 (Los Angeles Community College District, 1973).

The proportion of income from tuition and fees from resident students is nominal. For 1974-75 income from this source was $3.7 million (McIntyre, 1976). Another $11.6 million was derived from interdistrict tuition payments (not paid by students) and from non-resident and foreign students. The combined $15.3 million amounted to one and one-half percent of the total income of $1 billion (McPherran, 1976).

In all of the discussions there has been no serious challenge to the no-tuition policy for day resident students, other than to define credit classes for state funding purposes in a more precise and restrictive manner. It is highly improbable, short of a financial collapse, that the policy will be changed in the next five years.

Immediately vulnerable, primarily as a result of the threatened withdrawal of state funds, is the no-tuition policy for recreational, adult education and regular courses taken on a part-time basis by adults (California State Department of Finance, 1976). If state funding is withdrawn from some or all of these courses the colleges will continue to have the option of covering the loss through student fees or local revenues but the probability is that more will opt for student fees. The local financial situation in many districts is as serious as the state's.

Administrators seem reconciled to additional modifications in the no-tuition policy. In a "Position Paper on the Revenue Cap" prepared by Leslie Koltai, Chancellor of the Los Angeles Community Colleges for the Association of California Community College Administrators (ACCCA) he lists among 10 "Axioms for Re-Definition" the following:

> "Non-academic and non-occupational courses should be re-evaluated in terms of shifting costs to those individuals directly benefiting, and [after evaluation] in terms of an analysis of costs and benefits; programs should be made self-supporting where possible and appropriate" (1975).

The administrators' position represents a retreat from the strict no-tuition policy probably, to stave off a more direct drastic proposal of the State Department of Finance for a compulsory fee of $20 for full-time students and $10 for part-time students, increasing to $40 and $20 respectively by the fall of 1978 (California State Department of Finance, 1976). Although the fee is earmarked for non-instructional purposes – counseling, career guidance, placement, testing, cultural development – it is in fact a poorly-disguised form of tuition. Not too surprising a few administrators welcome the State Department of Finance proposal. For the record, most are against it (California Community and Junior College Association, 1976b).

If enacted the State Department of Finance proposal will be another step in the historical higher education pattern of converting from a no-tuition to a tuition policy – selective fee, compulsory fees, tuition – a pattern followed within recent memory by the California state colleges and universities.

Summary

At no time in the 75 year history of public two-year colleges has there been widespread acceptance of the no- or low-tuition policy. With rare exceptions at no time have the practicing educators accepted the no-tuition policy. In nearly every college tuition and/or "voluntary" and required fees have been charged.

From time to time state laws prohibited tuition but all of them were amended or circumvented to enable colleges to impose fees, until today there

is no state that prohibits the charging of tuition and/or fees. Once adopted states rarely repeal laws charging tuition.

More frequently than formerly state legislators beset with greater demands on financial resources than income available are pressing colleges to increase tuition and fees for some or all of their credit-courses, non-credit offerings, and services.

Tuition tends to rise as state subsidies decline. Where tuition limits are set by the state, the colleges have less freedom in adjusting tuition. When subsidies are increased tuition tends to remain static; rarely is it decreased.

The yearly average tuition and fees in 1974-75 has been variously estimated at $263 to $337. Tuition keeps rising from year to year on the average of 15 percent or more. By 1980 tuition will average at least $400.

Tuition and fees in two-year colleges average from 50 percent to 60 percent of those charged in the four-year colleges; about 70 percent, if two-year colleges in California, New York City and those with fewer than 1000 students are excluded.

On a scale of $0-$99 Low, $100-$299 Moderate, $300-$499 High, $500-up Very High, tuition and fees for the majority of students are Low to Moderate; for the majority of colleges they are Moderate to High.

Tuition and fees provide from less than one percent of college's income to almost 100 percent for one or two colleges; with an overall average of about 15 to 20 percent.

CONCLUSION

The many studies and analyses of tuition over the last fifty years provide little support for the belief that the public two-year colleges were ever no-tuition colleges. Exceptions existed but even they, such as the colleges in Arizona, California, Chicago and New York City, maintained a modified no-tuition policy. Nearly all of them now charge tuition and/or fees for all or part of the resident students. With this background and the probability of continued financial austerity it is fruitless to speculate on the prospects for a national no-tuition policy for the colleges. The most that can be hoped for outside California, is a moderate tuition policy in the range of $100 to $299. More probable is a high tuition range of $300 to $499. The Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education (1975) in its report on Low or No Tuition concluded that neither state action nor federal assistance to enable two-year colleges to lower tuition is promising. In the light of announcements of tuition increases in 1975 and 1976 the prospects have become even less promising. Also, the federal policy of awarding grants and loans to students indirectly acts as an incentive for colleges to increase tuition.

In most of the discussion on preserving the no-tuition myth for two-year colleges little is said about the responsibility of the colleges. There prevails an assumption that only more money from local property taxes, state subsidies and/or federal assistance will enable the colleges to lower, or more realistically maintain, the present student charges. Only during the past five years have questions been asked about the expansion of functions and activities, some of which impinge on or duplicate those being performed by other segments of education, non-educational public agencies and non-governmental groups. Very little internal discussion has taken place recently on methods of effecting economies of operation in teaching, administration and other activities. At a national meeting one would be startled to hear a serious presentation of the educators' role in restoring the no-tuition ideal through internal reforms that would bring expenditures in line with the available income.

The educators' assumptions, fostered and encouraged by national commissions and the professional associations, seem shortsighted in the light

of what is happening in various parts of the country. Because the educators have not been able or willing to control the urge to expand, the initiative to keep expenses in line with the available financial resources is being undertaken by elective and administrative officers in the state capitals. New York City is only a symbol of this process in its most extreme form. There not only is tuition being introduced but the open door policy may be restricted even more severely than it already is. Less severe belt-tightening tactics in other states are freezes on salaries and wages, percentage cuts in budgets already authorized, lower than anticipated state subsidies, and the almost unforgiveable "caps" on enrollment.

What effect tuition, particularly that in the $400 to $800 range, will have on another of the two-year college ideals, the open door, depends on the amount of state and federal grants available to those with limited incomes. While both have increased, the consensus is that they are still insufficient to provide for more than a small percentage of those applying for grants. Likewise, grants are often not large enough to help meet the costs of attending college. It seems reasonable to expect that as tuition rises to the $400 to $800 range a large number from low income families will not be able to attend the two-year college.

How many educators favor a tuition policy is difficult to determine. With few exceptions they publicly express their commitment to the low-tuition policy and make apologies for being forced by legislators or by economic constraints to continue charging tuition at even higher rates and to multiply fees for more and more services.

It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that though the great majority of educators are committed to the Open Door concept many of them – more than two-year college educators are willing to admit – do not subscribe to the statement of the President's Commission that "tuition-free education should be available in public institutions to all youth . . . for the traditional two-year junior college course" (Higher Education for American Democracy, 1947a, p. 37) or to the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges President Gleazer's broader statement that "a truly open-door institution will make no financial demand on the student" (1968, p. 134). By 1980 tuition and/or fees will be a condition of attendance in every two-year college, including those in California.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. 1975 Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory. Washington, D.C., 1975.

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. 1976 Com., Junior, and Technical College Directory. Washington, D.C., 1976a.

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. Supplementary Report: 1976 Com., Junior, and Technical College Directory. Washington, D.C., 1976b.

American Association of Junior Colleges. 1963 Junior College Directory. Washington, D.C., 1963.

American Association of Junior Colleges. 1972 Junior College Directory. Washington, D.C., 1972.

American Association of State Colleges and Universities. Clips and Comments on Tuition and Financing. Washington, D.C., November 1973.

American Association of State Colleges and Universities. "How to Fight for Low Tuition." Washington, D.C., February 25, 1974.

Arnett, Trevor. Trends in Tuition Fees in State and Endowed Colleges and Universities from 1928-29 through 1936-37. N.Y.: General Education Board, 1939.

Association of Community College Trustees. ACCT Tuition Review. Washington, D.C., September 15, 1973.

Association of Community College Trustees. ACCT Tuition Review. Washington, D.C., 1976.

Bogue, J.P. The Community College. First Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1950.

Bogue, J.P. (Ed.) "Present Trends in Junior Colleges." American Junior Colleges. Third Edition. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1952.

Bowen, H.R., and Servelle, P. Who Benefits from Higher Education and Who Should Pay? Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1972.

Brothers, E.Q. "A Plan for State Support for Public Junior Colleges." Paper presented at the Ninth Annual Meeting of the American Association of Junior Colleges, Fort Worth, 1928.

California Community and Junior College Association. "Arizona's Tuition Free Status Threatened." CCJCA News, 21 (4): 4; January 1976a.

California Community and Junior College Association. "SDF Fees Draw Criticism." CCJCA News, 21 (6): 1; March 1976b.

California Legislature. Report of the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education. Sacramento, California, September 1973.

California State Department of Finance. Summary Report on Proposed Reforms for California Adult Education in Community Colleges, High School Adult Schools, Regional Occupational Centers and Programs: An Alternative to the 5 Percent Cap. Sacramento, California, 1976.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Priorities for Action: Final Report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Berkeley, California, 1973.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Tuition: A Supplemental Statement. Berkeley, California, 1974.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. Low or No Tuition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1975.

Collins, C.C. Financing Higher Education: A Proposal. Topical Paper No. 10. Los Angeles, Calif.: ERIC Clearinghouse for Jr. Colleges, 1970.

Committee for Economic Development. The Management and Financing of Colleges. New York, 1973.

Council on Higher Education. Tuition and Fee Recommendations: Washington State Public Higher Education 1975-1977. Olympia, Washington, 1974.

Dwyer, W.G. Personal Communication. Boston: Massachusetts Board of Regional Community Colleges. November 3, 1975.

Eby, F. "The Junior College Movement in Texas." Texas Outlook, 2(2): 9-12; February 1927.

Education Commission of the States. Higher Education in the States, 5(2): 74; 1975.

Eells, W.C. The Junior College. Boston, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin, 1931.

Eells, W.C. Why Junior College Terminal Education? Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1941.

Florida Association of Community Colleges. "FACC Chapters Sponsor Legislative Days: Legislators Quizzed at Session." FACC Current, 7 (6): 3; Feb/March 1975.

Garrison, D.C. Personal Communication. Pendleton, South Carolina: Tri-County Technical College, February 3, 1976.

Gleazer, E.J., Jr. This Is the Community College. Boston, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1968.

Grant, W.V., and Lind, G.C. Digest of Educational Statistics. 1974 Edition. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics, 1975.

Green, R.E. "Where to Locate Junior Colleges." School Executives' Magazine, 49 (4): 178-180; December 1929.

Hackett, R.C. "Tuition Rates in Public Junior Colleges." Junior College Journal, 25 (4): 229-230; December 1954.

Halstead, D. Kent. Higher Education Prices and Price Indexes. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1975.

Higher Education for American Democracy. "Establishing the Goals." Vol. I. A Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education, Washington, D.C., December 1947a.

Higher Education for American Democracy. "Financing Higher Education." Vol. V. A Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education, Washington, D.C., December 1947b.

Huther, J.W. "The Open Door: How Open Is It?" Junior College Journal, 41 (7): 24-27; April 1971.

"Illinois Behind in Paying Bills; 'Crisis' is Denied." Los Angeles Times, October 11, 1975, Part I, pp. 1, 9.

Iowa State Department of Public Instruction. Data on Iowa's Area Schools 1973-74 School Year. Des Moines, Iowa, 1974.

Koltai, L. Management Report 76/2 Position Paper on the Revenue Cap. Paper presented to the Association of California Community College Administrators, December 12, 1975.

Koos, L.V. The Junior College. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1924.

Los Angeles Community College District. California Community Colleges Fees Survey. Los Angeles, California, 1973. 10pp. ED 085 049.

Losee, F.C. Personal Communication. St. George, Utah: Dixie College, February 19, 1976.

Magarrell, J. "CUNY's Crisis: Proposals Urge More State Support." The Chronicle of Higher Education, 11 (12): 4; December 1, 1975.

Martorana, S.V. "The Legal Status of American Public Junior Colleges." In J.P. Bogue (Ed.), American Junior Colleges. Third Edition. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1952.

Maryland State Board for Community Colleges. Selected Statistical Data 1970-1971. Annapolis, Maryland, April 1972.

McIntrye, C. Community College Finance Program 1976-77. Sacramento, Calif.: Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, 1976.

McPherran, A.L. "Financial Information for California Community Colleges' General Fund." Sacramento: California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, 1976.

Metropolitan Community Colleges (Missouri). "Financing a Community College." Impressions 76, 1 (1): 2-3; February 1976.

National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education. Financing Postsecondary Education in the United States. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973.

Ohio Board of Regents. The Two-Year College System in Ohio: A Planning Report. Columbus, Ohio, 1975. 32pp. ED 110 126.

Oregon Board of Education. "Tuition Rates in Oregon Community Colleges, 1975-76 School Year." Salem, Oregon, 1975.

Palinchak, R. The Evolution of the Community College. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarcrow Press, Inc., 1973.

Peterson, I. "Carey Easing Opposition to Tuition Fees at City U." New York Times, December 20, 1975, p. 32.

Pifer, A. "Higher Education in the Nation's Consciousness." Annual Report 1975. New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York, 1975.

Richardson, R.C., Jr. "Tuition in Com. Colleges: Another View." Com. and Jr. College Journal, 44 (9): 21, 24-25; June/July 1974.

Scully, M.G. "College-Going: Costlier Next Fall." The Chronicle of Higher Education, 10 (6): 1; March 31, 1975.

Simon, K.A., and Frankel, M.M. Projections of Educational Statistics to 1981-82. 1972 Edition. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics, 1973.

Simon, K.A., and Grant, W.V. Digest of Educational Statistics. 1965 Edition. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Educational Research and Development and National Center for Educational Statistics, 1965.

Spencer, T. Sources of Income for Community College Capital Outlay 1970-71. Little Rock, Ark.: Department of Higher Education, 1972a.

Spencer, T. Sources of Income for Community College Current Operation 1970-71. Little Rock, Ark.: Department of Higher Education, 1972b.

Starrak, J.A., and Hughes, R.M. The New Junior College: The Next Step in Free Public Education. Ames: Iowa State College Press, 1948.

State Board of Directors for Community Colleges of Arizona. "Fees for Academic Year 1975-76." Phoenix, Arizona, 1975a.

State Board of Directors for Community Colleges of Arizona. "Fees, Tuition, Waivers." Rules and Regulations. Phoenix, Arizona, 1975b.

Terrey, J.N. Personal Communication. Olympia, Washington: State Board for Community College Education, February 27, 1976.

Thornton, J.W. The Community Junior College. N.Y.: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1960.

Toews, E.O. History of the Junior College Movement in California. Sacramento, Calif.: Bureau of Junior College Education, 1964.

Wattenbarger, J.L.; Holcombe, W.N.; Myrick, S.L.; and Paulson, C.R. "State-Local Financing for the Seventies." New Directions for Community Colleges, 1 (2): 1-16; Summer 1973a.

Wattenbarger, J.L.; Schafer, S.; and Zucker, J.D. "Tuition and the Open Door." New Directions for Community Colleges, 1 (2): 57-64; Summer 1973b.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

OCT 29 1976

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES